

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that in respect of candidates drawn from South Canara who should have been admitted in the normal course to the M.A., and M.Sc., admission was denied because the University delayed in declaring the results and communicating the results to the students?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Even admitting that communication was sent on 6th and 3 days would take to reach the boys, the date was extended upto 31st July. They could have applied within that date.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have given in the answer that the last date for admission is 12th and it was extended till 31st. But the date on which the application should have been filed did not alter. Because the results reached the colleges concerned late and because the students came to know of the results late because of the floods etc., the last date for application was not revised.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—The last date for admission was 12th July without penal fee and 31st July with penal fee.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The date fixed for the last day of application for admission was not changed; that is my point.

(No Answer)

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, the results were declared on 15th July and the last date for admission is 12th July. How does the Minister expect the students to apply for admission on that date?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—The date was extended till 31st. The only question that can be asked is, how we can charge the penal fee. For about 58 boys the results were announced late because one of the examiners fell ill and there was some delay in his sending the marks.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Under these circumstances how do you expect the students to apply?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—There is no complaint whatsoever about these students that they did not get the marks cards in time.

COLLECTION OF LAND REVENUE IN SCARCITY VILLAGES OF BELLARY DISTRICT.

*Q.—759. Sri M. M. PATEEL (Hadagalli).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it is fact that the major portion of land revenue has been collected in most of the scarcity villages of Bellary District even though Government have sanctioned land revenue remission to all those affected villages;

(b) whether they are aware that only a few villages were benefited by the remission order of the Government;

(c) the action Government propose to take in the matter?

A.—Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—

(a) No.

(b) No. All the persons who are eligible for remission were benefited by the orders issued in G. O. No. RDF 4 TRM 61, dated 3rd May 1961 under which remission of land revenue on dry lands was sanctioned in the following affected parts of the District :—

Bellary Taluk	All the villages	100 per cent
Siriguppa Taluk	do	75 „
Mallapuram Taluk	17 villages	75 „
Hadagalli Taluk	19 do	75 „

(c) In the few cases where amount was collected before receipt of the Government Order referred to above, the persons will not lose the amount as it will be adjusted towards the land revenue due from them for previous years or for the next year.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ನನ್ನ (ನಿ) ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆದೇಶ ತಲುಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಪಾವತಿಯಾದ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದ ಬಾಕಿ ಇದ್ದು ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಎಡ್ಜಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅಂತಹ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟಿವೆ? ಅಂತಹ ಕೇಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲವಾದುದು ಮತ್ತು ವಸೂಲಿಯಾದ ಕಂದಾಯ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಆಗಿದೆ ಈ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇದುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ?

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಸ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅಂತಹ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ. ಅವುಗಳ ವಿವರವೂ ಈಗ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ನನ್ನ (ಎ) ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ಈ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಮಾತೂ ಸಹ ಬೇಡ. ಇಂತಿಂಥ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಈ ಬಾಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಸ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವಿರೇಬಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈಗಲೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನೋಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ನನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಕಂದಾಯ ಕರೆಕ್ಟನ್ ಆಗಿದೆವೆಂಬುದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಆ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆಗಲೇ ಆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question hour is over.

QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY

(but not taken up)

REVISION OF PAY SCALES OF OFFICERS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENTS IN HYDERABAD KARNATAK AREA.

***Q.—999. Sri BALWANT RAO (Bhalki).—**

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether it is not a fact that the pay scales of the officers of Local Government and Rural Development Departments in Hyderabad Karnatak area have not been revised since 1957;

(b) whether it is not a fact that the revision of pay scales ordered through Government Order No. LLH 72 CET, dated 18th July 1959 is not applicable to the Officers of Local Government cadre in the Hyderabad Karnatak area and it is applicable only to the employees of the Local Bodies;

(c) whether it is not a fact that the Officers of the Local Government Service of Hyderabad Karnatak are not employees of Local Bodies, but there are State Government Servants as per the clarification of the Finance Department;

(d) the reasons for not applying the Government Order No. FD 17 SRP (1) 61, dated 27th February 1961 to the Officers of Local Government Services of Hyderabad Karnatak area while the officers of the entire State are being benefited from the said order;

(e) the steps they intend to take for revising the pay scales of the Officers of Local Government Service of Hyderabad Karnatak Area?

A.—Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Development and Local Self-Government).—

(a) It is a fact that pay scales of Officers of the Local Government Department in the Hyderabad Karnatak area except in the case of 1st Grade Executive Officers of Raichur and Gulbarga City Municipalities and in the case of Junior Secretaries (i.e., Executive Officers of four City Municipalities) have not been revised since 1957.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) It was not intended to exclude the employees of the Local Service Government Department of Hyderabad Karnatak area. The omission was apparently due to the concerned Head of the Department in not furnishing the particulars of existing scales (as on 31st December 1960).

(e) Action is being taken.